UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/775,612	02/10/2004	Edward Melomed	13768.1430	1584

47973   7590   01/20/2011
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER
SAINT CYR, LEONARD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/20/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _29 October 2010_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1, 2, 4 – 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17 – 28, 30, 32, and 33_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1, 2, 4 – 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17 – 28, 30, 32, and 33_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _10 February 2004_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims *1, 2, 4 – 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17 – 28,*

30, 32, and 33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of

rejection.

Applicants argue that neither Harris, nor Liddy et al., nor Park et al., nor Cook et

al., teach or suggest; a unit conversion component configured to convert units of

currency from the base system language into units of currency of the one or more other

determined languages, and wherein the translation component is configured to obtain

an exchange rate at a time when the translation component converts units of currency

such that conversion of currency is dynamic and based on a then current exchange rate

(Amendment, pages 10 – 13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

3.   Claims *1, 2, 4 – 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17 – 28, 30, 32, and 33* are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris (US PAP 2002/0059204) in view of

Liddy et al., (US Patent 6,006,221),further in view of Park et al., (US Patent 6,064,951);

and further in view of Cook et al., (US Patent 6,771,275); and further in view of Kawase

(US PAP 6600919).

As per claim 1, Harris teaches a data translation system for interacting with data stored in a database in a base system language and that is queryable using a specified query format, the data translation system facilitating user interaction with the stored data using the base system language or any of one or more other different languages, the base system language and the one or more other different languages each corresponding to a language that humans use to verbally transfer information to one another, the data translation system (paragraph 47) comprising:

one or more processors (paragraphs 32, and 46);

an interface component that receives user queries for stored data from a user, the queries receivable in the base system language and any of the one or more other different languages, the queries also receivable in the specified query format and any of a plurality of different query formats ("**Searches or queries can be initiated using natural language…dynamically generated customized query can be formed…in a language written or spoken by humans**"; paragraphs 7, and 37);

a translation component configured to receive user queries from the user interface and pass the received user queries to a query conversion component for conversion ("**A dictionary 18 can be equipped with a foreign language translator to convert received query information from one language, to another language that is compatible with the data source 20**"; paragraph 47);

a query conversion component, that is different from the translation component, the query conversion component for converting received user queries into converted user queries in the specified query format in the based system language ("**a**

customized dictionary that can convert a natural language or keyword search query to a precise SQL query… A dictionary 18 can be equipped with a foreign language translator to convert received query information from one language, to another language that is compatible with the data source 20"; paragraphs 9, and 47), including:

receiving a user query from the translation component ("**a customized dictionary that can convert a natural language or keyword search query to a precise SQL query**"; paragraph 9);

converting the received user query from any of the one or more other different languages into the base system language ("**convert received query information from one language, to another language that is compatible with the data source 20**"; paragraph 47);

converting the received user query in the base system language into the specified query format in accordance with definition rules that specifies query syntax and semantic information for the specified query format subsequent to converting the received user query into the base system language ("**a customized SQL query that uses terminology…identify synonyms**"; paragraphs 44, and 45);

returning the converted user query back to the translation component; wherein the translation component is further configured to pass the converted user query to a user query engine ("**the customized query 110 can be applied to the data source 20**" paragraph 31);

a query engine configured to receive a converted query from the translation

component, submit the converted query to the database, receive a query response

containing stored data responsive to the converted query from the database, the stored

data in the base system language, and pass query response data back to the

translation component (**"the customized query search results can be returned to the

data access module 46 and thereafter transferred to the formatting module 48

with the specified output format. The formatting module 48 can format the query

results based on the specified format, and transfer the formatted output to the

server 16 through the API 33"**; paragraph 62).

However, Harris does not specifically teach that the translation component is

further configured to receive the query response from the query engine and translate

the stored data into any of the one or more other languages in accordance with proper

punctuation, syntax and semantic of the other languages, translation including

determining any of the one or more other different languages that the stored data is to

be translated into, and for each of the one or more determined other different

languages: referring to language specific translation tables to statically translate

portions of the stored data; and for any portions of the stored data for which static

translation is insufficient, dynamically translating the portions of the stored data through

reference to an inference component, wherein the translation component is further

configured to provide the stored data in the one or more other determined languages to

the interface component.

Liddy et al., disclose, that this does not mean, however, **that retrieved**

documents could not then be translated, by machine or otherwise, if deemed

appropriate by the user. Using the original language of the input text as a useful

context for selecting the most appropriate sense of the words in a sentence.

With CINDOR, **only those few documents that obtain a high relevance ranking and**

show promise in their transliterated form become candidates for full translation, if

desired. The selection of words could be based on (1) whether they have been

indexed in the MCD, (2) their POS-tag assignment, (3) anaphoric disambiguation,

and (4) meta-textual and discourse-level considerations, such as whether words

and phrases are in the headline of a text...CINDOR thus ensures that only those few

documents that are especially pertinent to a query will undergo the full translation

process (col.7, lines 18 – 21; col.11, lines 56 – 58; col.22, lines 20 - 56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to translate the retrieved documents as taught by Liddy et

al., in view of Harris, so that the retrieved documents can be clearly understood by

different groups of people (col.22, lines 30 - 35).

However, Harris in view of Liddy et al., do not specifically teach translation in

according to proper punctuation, syntax and semantics of the other languages.

Park et al., teach that if there are translations generated, executing a comparison

processing for the generated translations, based on a semantic category tree, thereby

eliminating unnecessary ones of the translations; analyzing a collocation of the resultant

translations by reference to a collocation information dictionary, thereby eliminating

unnecessary one of the analyzed translations (col.2, lines 48 – 55; col.7, lines 9 - 14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to use a semantic tree and a collocation information

dictionary in translation as taught by Park et al., in Harris in view of Liddy et al., because

that would eliminate an ambiguousness of words involved in the transformation of the

queries; thereby generating a desired query usable as an input for the Web information

retrieval system (col.2, lines 15 – 18).

Harris in view of Liddy et al., further in view of Park et al., do not specifically

teach a multidimensional database that stores analytical data; a unit conversion

component configured to convert units of measurement from the base system language

into units of measurement of the one or more other determined languages.

Cook et al., teach a multidimensional database that stores analytical data; a unit

conversion component configured to convert units of measurement from the base

system language into units of measurement of the one or more other determined

languages ("The multidimensional lookup table is optimized so as to not contain an

excessive amount of data. Each entry contains a base value associated with a given

input RGB value…conversion of distances from metric to English units can be

performed trivially using linear interpolation or extrapolation from a look-up table having

only two data points"; col.1, lines 57 – 60; col.3, lines 45 – 50).

Harris in view of Liddy et al., further in view of Park et al., contain a base process

of translating the query input and the retrieved response in one or more other

languages, which the claimed invention can be seen as an improvement in converting units of measurement from the base system language into units of measurement of the one or more other determined languages.

Cook et al., contain known technique of conversion component configured to convert units of measurement from the base system language into units of measurement of the one or more other determined languages using a multidimensional database (col.1, lines 57 – 60; col.3, lines 45 – 50) that is applicable to the base process.

Cook et al's known technique of conversion component configured to convert units of measurement from the base system language into units of measurement of the one or more other determined languages using a multidimensional database (col.1, lines 57 – 60; col.3, lines 45 – 50) would have recognized by one skilled in the art as applicable to the base process of Harris in view of Liddy et al., further in view of Park et al., and the results would have been predictable and resulted in translating portions of the stored data; translating the portions of the stored data through reference to an inference component; wherein the translation component further includes a unit conversion component configured to convert units of measurement from the base system language into unit of measurement of the one or more other determined languages using the multidimensional database, which results in an improved process.

Therefore, the claimed subject matter would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Harris in view of Liddy et al., further in view of Park et al., and further in view of Cook et al., do not specifically teach a unit conversion component configured to convert units of currency from the base system language into units of currency of the one or more other determined languages, and wherein the translation component is configured to obtain an exchange rate at a time when the translation component converts units of currency such that conversion of currency is dynamic and based on a then current exchange rate.

Kawase that a cellular phone is programmed to automatically convert language or currency of a home country into corresponding language or currency of different countries. When the cellular phone is used in the country in which the same communication protocol as that in the home country and the international roaming are available, the cellular phone determines from a received county ID code where it is used. It automatically performs various conversions such as language conversion or currency conversion with reference to a stored language dictionary or a retrieved currency exchange rate, respectively (col.1, lines 35 – 52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use currency conversion in data translation system as taught by Kawase in Harris in view of Liddy et al., further in view of Park et al., and further in view of Cook et al., so that travelers are enabled to use the cellular phone to communicate in different languages or shop in different currencies without any barrier (col.1, lines 50 - 52).

As per claim 2, Liddy et al., further disclose a language identification component that determines the specified language of a user (col.7, line 26).

As per claims 4, Harris in view of Liddy et al., and further in view of Park et al., further disclose that the request is a structured query (Harris "**a precise SQL query; paragraph 9)** in the user's preferred language (Liddy et al., "enter queries in the user's native language"; col.2, lines 52 - 54).

As per claim 5, Liddy et al., further disclose that the request is a natural language request (col.2, lines 44, and 45).

As per claim 6, Liddy et al., further disclose that the translation component comprises: one or more translation tables; and a mapping component that maps retrieved data to its corresponding translation in a translation table (fig.4 shows translation tables that map French words to English words; col11, lines 13 – 15; col.15, lines 42 – 49).

As per claim 7, Liddy et al., further disclose that the translation tables are set up by a database administrator ("multilingual mapping terminology managers"; col.13, 18, and 19; col.22, lines 50 – 53).

As per claim 9, Liddy et al., further disclose that the inference component including a dictionary component to facilitate data translations (col.11, lines 32, and 60 – 64).

As per claim 10, Liddy et al., further disclose that a context analyzer that receives metadata associated with result data with the query response (Liddy et al., "meta-textual"; col.22, lines 27 – 29).

As per claim 12, Harris further disclose that the queries are specified in one of the other different languages (Harris, "**Searches or queries can be initiated using natural language…dynamically generated customized query can be formed…in a language written or spoken by humans**"; paragraphs 7, and 37);

As per claim 13, Liddy et al., further disclose that the request is a natural language request (col.2, lines 44, and 45).

As per claim 17, Harris further discloses that a dictionary component that dynamically translates data ("dictionary customized"; Abstract).

As per claim 18, Liddy et al., further disclose a sort component that receives collation information from a user and sorts resulting data in accordance with the collation information ("components in a query tend to occur in a certain repetitive

sequence... documents are arranged in ranked order according to their relative relevance to the substance of a query"; col.17, lines 12, and 13; col.18, lines 35 – 37).

As per claim 19, Liddy et al., further disclose that the collation information includes the language to be used for sorting ("enter queries in the user's native language"; col.2, lines 52 - 54).

As per claim 20, Liddy et al., in view of Cook et al., further disclose that the translation component is configured translate data and metadata ("meta-textual") from a multidimensional database (Park et al., col.1, lines 57 – 60) in accordance with a received query ("database that includes documents in at least one other language of the plurality of supported languages"; col.2, lines 46 – 48; col.22, lines 20 - 56).

As per claim 21, Liddy et al., further disclose that the translation component maps resulting data and metadata to a translation table to produce translated data and metadata (fig.4 shows translation tables that map French words to English words; col11, lines 13 – 15; col.15, lines 42 – 49).

As per claim 22, Harris teach a computer-implemented method of querying data stored in a data store in a base system and that is queryable using a specified query format, the method comprising:

receiving a language selection, the language selection specifying a language

from among one or more other different languages, the language selection being an

indication that queries are to be entered and data presented in the specified language,

the specified language corresponding to a language that humans use to verbally

exchange information ("**Searches or queries can be initiated using natural**

language…dynamically generated customized query can be formed…in a

language written or spoken by humans"; paragraphs 7, and 37);

receiving a query in the specified language and in query format other than the

specified query format; converting the received query into the specified query format in

the base system language, the base system language corresponding to a second

different language that humans used to verbally exchange information, including:

converting the received query from the specified language into the base system

language ("**a customized dictionary that can convert a natural language or**

keyword search query to a precise SQL query… A dictionary 18 can be equipped

with a foreign language translator to convert received query information from one

language, to another language that is compatible with the data source 20";

paragraphs 9, and 47);

converting the received user query in the base system language into the

specified query format in accordance with definition rules that specifies query syntax

and semantic information for the specified query format subsequent to converting the

received user query into the base system language ("**a customized SQL query that**

uses terminology…identify synonyms"; paragraphs 44, and 45);

submitting the converted query to the data store, receiving a query response

containing stored data responsive to the converted query from the data store, the stored

data in the base system language ("**the customized query search results can be**

returned to the data access module 46 and thereafter transferred to the formatting

module 48 with the specified output format. The formatting module 48 can format

the query results based on the specified format, and transfer the formatted output

to the server 16 through the API 33"; paragraph 62).

However, Harris does not specifically teach translating the stored data from the

base system language to the specified language including: referring to a language

specific translation table to statically translate portions of the stored data; and for any

portions of the stored data for which static translation is insufficient, dynamically

translating the portions of the stored data through reference to an inference component;

and utilizing context information to provide an accurate translation that conforms to

proper punctuation, syntax, and semantics of the selected language; and providing the

stored data in the specified language to an interface.

Liddy et al., disclose, that this does not mean, however, **that retrieved**

documents could not then be translated, by machine or otherwise, if deemed

appropriate by the user. Using the original language of the input text as a useful

context for selecting the most appropriate sense of the words in a sentence.

With CINDOR, **only those few documents that obtain a high relevance ranking and**

show promise in their transliterated form become candidates for full translation, if

desired. The selection of words could be based on (1) whether they have been

indexed in the MCD, (2) their POS-tag assignment, (3) anaphoric disambiguation,

and (4) meta-textual and discourse-level considerations, such as whether words

and phrases are in the headline of a text...CINDOR thus ensures that only those few

documents that are especially pertinent to a query will undergo the full translation

process (col.7, lines 18 – 21; col.11, lines 56 – 58; col.22, lines 20 - 56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to translate the retrieved documents as taught by Liddy et

al., in view of Harris, so that the retrieved documents can be clearly understood by

different groups of people (col.22, lines 30 - 35).

However, Harris in view of Liddy et al., do not specifically teach utilizing context

information to provide an accurate translation that conforms to proper punctuation,

syntax and semantics of the language.

Park et al., teach that if there are translations generated, executing a comparison

processing for the generated translations, based on a semantic category tree, thereby

eliminating unnecessary ones of the translations; analyzing a collocation of the resultant

translations by reference to a collocation information dictionary, thereby eliminating

unnecessary one of the analyzed translations (col.2, lines 48 – 55; col.7, lines 9 - 14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to use a semantic tree and a collocation information

dictionary in translation as taught by Park et al., in Harris in view of Liddy et al., because

that would eliminate an ambiguousness of words involved in the transformation of the

queries; thereby generating a desired query usable as an input for the Web information retrieval system (col.2, lines 15 – 18).

Harris in view of Liddy et al., further in view of Park et al., do not specifically teach a multidimensional database that stores analytical data; a unit conversion component to convert units of measurement in the base language system to units of measurement in the specified language.

Cook et al., teach a multidimensional database that stores analytical data; a unit conversion component to convert units of measurement in the base language system to units of measurement in the specified language ("The multidimensional lookup table is optimized so as to not contain an excessive amount of data. Each entry contains a base value associated with a given input RGB value...conversion of distances from metric to English units can be performed trivially using linear interpolation or extrapolation from a look-up table having only two data points"; col.1, lines 57 – 60; col.3, lines 45 – 50).

Harris in view of Liddy et al., further in view of Park et al., contain a base process of translating the query input and the retrieved response in one or more other languages, which the claimed invention can be seen as an improvement in converting units of measurement in the base language system to units of measurement in the specified language using a multidimensional database.

Cook et al., contain known technique of conversion component to convert units of measurement in the base language system to units of measurement in the specified

language using a multidimensional database (col.1, lines 57 – 60; col.3, lines 45 – 50)

that is applicable to the base process.

Cook et al's known technique of conversion component to convert units of

measurement in the base language system to units of measurement in the specified

language using a multidimensional database (col.1, lines 57 – 60; col.3, lines 45 – 50)

would have recognized by one skilled in the art as applicable to the base process of

Harris in view of Liddy et al., further in view of Park et al., and the results would have

been predictable and resulted in statistically translating portions of the stored data;

referring to a unit conversion component to convert units of measurement in the base

language system to units of measurement in the specified language, using the

multidimensional database, Which results in an improved process.

Therefore, the claimed subject matter would have been obvious to a person

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Harris in view of Liddy et al., further in view of Park et al., and further in view of

Cook et al., do not specifically teach a unit conversion component configured to convert

units of currency from the base system language into units of currency of the one or

more other determined languages, and wherein the translation component is configured

to obtain an exchange rate at a time when the translation component converts units of

currency such that conversion of currency is dynamic and based on a then current

exchange rate.

Kawase that a cellular phone is programmed to automatically convert language

or currency of a home country into corresponding language or currency of different

countries. When the cellular phone is used in the country in which the same

communication protocol as that in the home country and the international roaming are

available, the cellular phone determines from a received county ID code where it is

used. It automatically performs various conversions such as language conversion or

currency conversion with reference to a stored language dictionary or a retrieved

currency exchange rate, respectively (col.1, lines 35 – 52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to use currency conversion in data translation system as

taught by Kawase in Harris in view of Liddy et al., further in view of Park et al., and

further in view of Cook et al., so that travelers are enabled to use the cellular phone to

communicate in different languages or shop in different currencies without any barrier

(col.1, lines 50 - 52).

As per claim 23, Harris in view of Liddy et al., and further in view of Park et al.,

further discloses entering a query in the specified language (Liddy et al., col.7, line 26).

As per claim 24, Liddy et al., further disclose retrieving metadata from a

translation table, the metadata describing the stored data ("meta-textual"; col.22, lines

20 - 56).

As per claim 25, Liddy et al., further disclose dynamically translating the portions

of the stored data through reference to an inference component comprises the inference

component utilizing a dictionary ("**only those few documents that obtain a high**

relevance ranking and show promise in their transliterated form become

candidates for full translation, if desired. The selection of words could be based

on (1) whether they have been indexed in the MCD, (2) their POS-tag assignment,

(3) anaphoric disambiguation, and (4) meta-textual and discourse-level

considerations" col.22, lines 20 - 56).

As per claim 26, Liddy et al., further disclose that the query is a natural language

query (col.2, lines 44, and 45).

As per claim 27, Liddy et al., further disclose that data store is multidimensional

database ("database that includes documents in at least one other language of the

plurality of supported languages"; col.2, lines 46 – 48).

As per claim 28, Liddy et al., further disclose that a computer readable medium at

least one of volatile system memory, non-volatile system memory, or disk storage, the

computer readable media having stored thereon computer executable instructions for

carrying out the method of claim 22 (col.4, lines 25 – 27).

As per claim 30, Liddy et al., in view of Park et al., and further in view of Harris

further disclose that first language is selected from naming German, Spanish, Russian,

French, and Chinese and the base system language is English (Liddy et al., "A current

implementation supports English, French, German, Spanish, Dutch, and Italian.

However, the system is modular, and as additional languages are added to the

document databases, those languages become searchable"; col.3, lines 15 – 22).

As per claim 32, Liddy et al., in view of Park et al., and further in view of Harris

further referring to a language specific translation table to statically translate portions of

the stored data comprises mapping data and meta-data to the language specific

translation table (Liddy et al., fig.4 shows translation tables that map French words to

English words; col.11, lines 13 – 15; col.15, lines 42 – 49; col.22, lines 20 - 56).

As per claim 33, Liddy et al., further disclose sorting the translated stored data

based on collation properties specified by a user ("components in a query tend to occur

in a certain repetitive sequence... documents are arranged in ranked order according to

their relative relevance to the substance of a query"; col.17, lines 12, and 13; col.18,

lines 35 – 37).

Conclusion

4.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to LEONARD SAINT CYR whose telephone number is

(571)272-4247. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Friday.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-

273-8300.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or (571)-272-1000.

LS
01/04/11
/Leonard Saint-Cyr/
Examiner, Art Unit 2626